



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2006

---

## Reply to Gordon Tullock

Frey, Bruno S ; Stutzer, Alois

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-006-6607-z>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-156407>

Journal Article

Published Version

Originally published at:

Frey, Bruno S; Stutzer, Alois (2006). Reply to Gordon Tullock. The Review of International Organizations, 1(1):47-48.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-006-6607-z>

# Reply to Gordon Tullock

**Bruno S. Frey · Alois Stutzer**

© Springer Science + Business Media, Inc. 2006

We are grateful to Gordon Tullock for his welcome comments on our paper. He raises two counterarguments.

## 1. Number of Trustees per Nation

Tullock argues that big countries such as the United States, India or China should have more weight in an international organization's decision making.

Our paper starts from the status quo according to which in many international organizations each member country, large or small, has the same number of votes. We therefore propose that the same number of citizens are randomly selected from each member country. But this is no essential characteristic of our proposal which rather is that the citizens should have the possibility to have a direct say.

In Footnote 6 we entertain the possibility to have different weights, and we explicitly refer to the number of trustees being proportional to the size of the population or of the financial contribution. The fact that Gordon Tullock wishes to have large countries having more weight therefore, in our view, is no valid argument against our proposal of democratizing international organizations.

## 2. Non-Democratic Nations

Gordon Tullock is certainly correct in stating that many, if not most, countries in the world are not democratic. As we explicitly state in Section 4.2, we are well aware that in dictatorial or repressive countries the government will influence the decisions taken by the randomly selected trustees. In the extreme, the votes cast by such a country will be the same as now where the government directly selects representatives and orders them to vote according to its interests. However, that is only the

---

B. S. Frey (✉) · A. Stutzer  
Institute for Empirical Research in Economics, University of Zurich,  
Bluemlisalpstrasse 10, CH-8006, Zurich, Switzerland  
CREMA - Center for Research in Economics, Management and the Arts,  
Niederdorfstr.29, CH-8001 Zurich, Switzerland  
e-mail: bsfrey@iew.unizh.ch

A. Stutzer  
e-mail: astutzer@iew.unizh.ch

most extreme, worst case in which the situation is as bad as today. But in many cases, the situation is likely to improve, i.e., to be more democratic than today, because the non-democratic governments find it difficult or even impossible to fully control the behavior of the trustees. The fact that according to our proposal they are randomly selected gives them a measure of independence vis-a-vis their own government. This voting procedure imposed by the international organization as a whole gives the citizens more power. This is a step towards democratization. We agree that exactly for that reason dictatorships will oppose randomly selected trustees. But the advantages of being a member of a particular international organization may outweigh this concern so that such non-democratic nations will be prepared to swallow awarding more participation rights to their citizens.